



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,643.	01/15/2004	KahHing Ting	STL11217	5810
7590 02/15/2007 Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey & Tippens, P.C. Suite 1700 100 North Broadway Oklahoma City, OK 73102-8820			EXAMINER STACE, BRENT S	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			02/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,643

Applicant(s)

TING ET AL.

Examiner

Brent S. Stace

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed November 28th, 2006. Claims 1-7, 9-18, and 20 are pending. In the Amendment filed November 28th, 2006, Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 20 are amended, Claims 8 and 19 are canceled, and Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. The examiner acknowledges that no new matter was introduced and the amended and new claims are supported by the specification. This action is made FINAL.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, filed November 28th, 2006, with respect to Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 have been considered but are not persuasive and are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. The Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting "simultaneously executing the plurality of query statements to access said database and transfer associated data subsets into a memory space by logging into the computer network under a different login account for each query statement" the examiner respectfully disagrees. Carley shows that it is beneficial to use single-login (using a single user-id). However, Carley merely suggests that management of coordinating the multiple ID's and passwords associated with the single logon may be difficult. However, it is possible (as suggested in Carley). Carley

Art Unit: 2161

makes it apparent that Carely uses single logon in Carley, col. 130, lines 57-60 with Carley, col. 131, lines 5-6. By using single login, and the requirement to coordinate the multiple ID's and passwords associated with the single logon ID, it is apparent that single login is used to activate the multiple ID's and passwords so that the user needs only to logon once (single logon) for the system to automatically use the correct multiple ID's and passwords to logon to other systems.

4. Applicant's arguments, filed November 28th, 2006, with respect to Claims 11-18 and 20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

5. The Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 11-18 and 20 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting "initiates an auto-brake function that limits input/output transfer elapsed time to a maximum value during said transfers of the associated data subsets into the third memory space so that said transfers of the associated data subsets are interrupted when the maximum value is reached," the examiner respectfully disagrees. Marmor, paragraph [0031] was cited to rejection this limitation in Claim 11. Marmor, as cited and admitted by applicant's teaches a query packet where the query packet has a time to live (TTL). This TTL limits how long the query packet will be valid so the query packet is not immortal querying systems in Marmor for information. Applicant's arguments focus solely on Marmor. However, in the rejection below, Marmor is used in combination with Hallmark. Hallmark's queries retrieve content (Hallmark, col. 5, lines 60-63 "results"). Merely the TTL feature of Marmor's queries are being combined into Hallmark's queries (as originally stated). It

Art Unit: 2161

should also be noted that the queries in both systems, in a broad sense, retrieve/transfer content.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

6. The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously argued claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, filed November 28th, 2006, are moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still considered rejected based on their respective rejections from a prior Office action (part of recited below).

Response to Amendment

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The reference on the IDS (dated 1/15/2004) on page 2 identified by U.S. Patent No. 6,207,022 appears to be a typo since the reference deals with purification of crude (meth) acrylic acid and the publication data and name on the IDS do not match the U.S. Patent document matching U.S. Patent No. 6,207,022. The purification of crude (meth) acrylic acid appears to have no subject matter similar to the present application.

Drawings

Art Unit: 2161

8. In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the previous drawing objections to the drawings have been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

9. In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the previous claim objections to the claims have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the previous 35 USC § 112 rejections to the claims have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the previous 35 USC § 102 rejections to the claims have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 2161

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,180 (Hallmark et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,345 (Carley et al.).

For **Claim 1**, Hallmark teaches: "A method for querying a computerized database, [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 10-15] comprising:

- distributing a desired range of data values to be obtained from the database across a plurality of different query statements, [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 10-15 with Hallmark, col. 6, lines 20-33 with Hallmark, col. 8, lines 12-16] ...
- simultaneously executing the plurality of query statements to access said database and transfer associated data subsets into a memory space [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 10-15 with Hallmark, col. 6, lines 20-33] ...and
- arranging the associated data subsets to form the desired range of data values" [Hallmark, col. 6, lines 20-33 with Hallmark, col. 5, lines 22-34].

Hallmark discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

Art Unit: 2161

- "...the desired range accessible using a single login account of a computer network associated with the database;
- ...by logging into the computer network under a different login account for each query statement."

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Carley, teaches:

- "...the desired range accessible using a single login account of a computer network associated with the database; [Carley, col. 130, lines 42-47 with Hallmark, col. 8, lines 12-16]
- ...by logging into the computer network under a different login account for each query statement" [Carley, col. 130, lines 42-47 with Hallmark, col. 8, lines 12-16].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Carley and Hallmark before him/her to combine Carley with Hallmark because both inventions are directed towards accessing computer resources in computers.

Carley's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hallmark's invention because both inventions use computers accessing data in a network. Hallmark discloses a method and apparatus for implementing parallel operations in a database management system comprising query processing on a distributed/parallel, partitioned database. However, Hallmark does not expressly disclose database security features such as single signon/logon for accessing the data. Carley discloses a providing a notification when a plurality of users are altering similar

Art Unit: 2161

data in a health care solution environment comprising the capability of implementing single login.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Carley and Hallmark before him/her to take the single login with multiple account underpinning management from Carley and install it into the invention of Hallmark, thereby offering the obvious advantage of using a simple method of allowing access to a subset of resources and establishing roles/permissions easily for the authority required. Including security features in Hallmark would also make the database more resistant to outside tampering (accidental or not).

Claim 2 can be mapped to Hallmark (as modified by Carley) as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein the computerized database comprises a distributed database portions of which are stored in different locations linked by a computer network" [Hallmark, Figs. 1A-1D with Hallmark, col. 7, lines 19-23 with Hallmark, col. 7, lines 41-44].

Claim 3 can be mapped to Hallmark (as modified by Carley) as follows: "The method of claim 1, further comprising exporting the desired range of data values obtained from the arranging step to a second memory space" [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 20-33 with Hallmark, col. 6, lines 20-33].

Claim 4 can be mapped to Hallmark (as modified by Carley) as follows: "The method of claim 1, further comprising using an analysis routine to analyze the desired range of data values" [Hallmark, col. 1, lines 20-22 with Hallmark, col. 8, lines 12-34].

Claim 5 can be mapped to Hallmark (as modified by Carley) as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein at least one query statement retrieves data values from the database for a selected data field type, and wherein at least one other query statement retrieves data values from the data base for the selected data field type" [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 20-33 with Hallmark, col. 6, lines 20-33].

15. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,180 (Hallmark et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,345 (Carley et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,758 (Dockes et al.).

For **Claim 6**, Hallmark (as modified by Carley) teaches: "The method of claim 1, wherein the desired range of data values comprises."

Hallmark (as modified by Carley) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "manufacturing data associated with manufacture of a population of products."

With respect to Claim 6, an analogous art, Dockes, teaches: "manufacturing data associated with manufacture of a population of products" [Dockes, col. 7, lines 12-16 with Dockes, col. 16, lines 15-19 with Dockes, col. 19, lines 12-23].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Dockes with Hallmark (as modified by Carley) because both inventions are directed towards using databases in a client/server fashion.

Dockes's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hallmark (as modified by Carley)'s invention because both inventions use databases.

Hallmark (as modified by Carley) discloses a method and apparatus for implementing parallel operations in a database management system comprising query processing on a distributed/parallel, partitioned database, however Hallmark (as modified by Carley) does not expressly disclose the specific use of the database for manufacturing data or that the manufacturing data relates to data storage devices. Dockes discloses a system and method for production of compact discs on demand comprising writing CD's using a database of orders.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the specific use (manufacturing CD's/storage devices) and the manufacturing data from Dockes and install it into the invention of Hallmark (as modified by Carley), thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to use Hallmark (as modified by Carley)'s invention for a data processing system that writes CD's for requesting users so they may obtain the CD requested in Dockes.

Claim 7 can be mapped to Hallmark (as modified by Carley and Dockes) as follows: "The method of claim 6, wherein the products comprise data storage devices" [Dockes, col. 7, lines 12-16 with Dockes, col. 19, lines 12-23].

16. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,180 (Hallmark et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,345 (Carley et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062310 (Marmor et al.).

For **Claim 9**, Hallmark (as modified by Carley) teaches: "The method of claim 1, wherein the simultaneously executing step further comprises."

Hallmark (as modified by Carley) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "initiating an auto-brake function that limits input/output transfer elapsed time by a server associated with the computer network and the database to a maximum value during execution of a selected one of the plurality of query statements."

With respect to Claim 9, an analogous art, Marmor, teaches: "initiating an auto-brake function that limits input/output transfer elapsed time by a server associated with the computer network and the database to a maximum value during execution of a selected one of the plurality of query statements" [Marmor, paragraph [0031]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Marmor with Hallmark (as modified by Carley) because both inventions are directed towards querying database(s).

Marmor's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hallmark (as modified by Carley)'s invention because both inventions use databases on computers. Hallmark (as modified by Carley) discloses a method and apparatus for implementing parallel operations in a database management system comprising query processing on a distributed/parallel, partitioned database, however Hallmark (as modified by Carley) does not expressly disclose limiting I/O transfer elapsed time. Marmor discloses a peer-to-peer commerce system comprising a TTL query packet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the TTL from Marmor and install it into the invention of Hallmark (as

Art Unit: 2161

modified by Carley), thereby offering the obvious advantage of not having immortal query packets thereby speeding up the system by limiting how long I/O is sent by the elimination of old query packets.

17. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,180 (Hallmark et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,345 (Carley et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,758 (Dockes et al.), further in view of "Man: Crontab(5)" (Crontab).

For **Claim 10**, Hallmark (as modified by Carley) teaches: "The method of claim 1, wherein the distributing, simultaneously executing and arranging steps."

Hallmark (as modified by Carley) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "are carried out on a repetitive, daily basis to obtain data relating to an ongoing manufacturing process."

With respect to Claim 10, an analogous art, Crontab, teaches: "daily basis" [Crontab, page 3, from the top through "Example Cron File"].

With respect to Claim 10, an analogous art, Dockes, teaches: "are carried out on a repetitive, to obtain data relating to an ongoing manufacturing process" [Dockes, col. 7, lines 10-16 with Dockes, col. 9, lines 9-13 with Dockes, col. 16, lines 15-19 with Dockes, col. 19, lines 12-23].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Dockes and Crontab with Hallmark (as modified by Carley) because the inventions are directed towards using computers.

Dockes's and Crontab invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hallmark (as modified by Carley)'s invention because the inventions use computers. Hallmark (as modified by Carley) discloses a method and apparatus for implementing parallel operations in a database management system comprising query processing on a distributed/parallel, partitioned database, however Hallmark (as modified by Carley) does not expressly disclose the specific use of the database for a manufacturing process. Dockes discloses a system and method for production of compact discs on demand comprising writing CD's using a database of orders. Crontab discloses a computer command for daily repetitive execution of a command comprising the ability to execute a command on a daily basis.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the specific use (manufacturing CD's/storage devices) from Dockes and the crontab command from Crontab and install them into the invention of Hallmark (as modified by Carley), thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to use Hallmark (as modified by Carley)'s invention for a data processing system that writes CD's for requesting users so they may obtain the CD requested in Dockes. The execution of getting an order from the database and making a job file from it would then be done on at least a daily basis to keep the job spooling directory relatively full at all times so that there is always at least one job ready for dispatch. This makes the autonomous system of Dockes more efficient.

Art Unit: 2161

18. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,180 (Hallmark et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062310 (Marmor et al.).

For **Claim 11**, Hallmark teaches: "A computer system, [Hallmark, Figs. 1A-1D with Hallmark, col. 7, lines 41-44] comprising:

- a database stored in a first memory space and accessible by a computer; [Hallmark, col. 7, lines 41-44 with Hallmark, col. 5, lines 23-34] and
- a query engine stored in a second memory space which, upon execution [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 34-44] distributes a desired range of data values to be obtained from the database across a plurality of different query statements, [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 10-15 with Hallmark, col. 6, lines 20-33 with Hallmark, col. 8, lines 12-16] simultaneously executes the plurality of query statements to access the database and transfer associated data subsets into a third memory space, and arranges the associated data subsets to form the desired range of data values" [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 10-15 with Hallmark, col. 6, lines 20-33].

Hallmark discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "...wherein the query engine further initiates an auto-brake function that limits input/output transfer elapsed time to a maximum value during said transfers of the associated data subsets into the third memory space so that said transfers of the associated data subsets are interrupted when the maximum value is reached."

With respect to Claim 11, an analogous art, Marmor, teaches:

- "...wherein the query engine further initiates an auto-brake function that limits input/output transfer elapsed time to a maximum value during said transfers of the associated data subsets into the third memory space so that said transfers of the associated data subsets are interrupted when the maximum value is reached" [Marmor, paragraph [0031]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Marmor and Hallmark before him/her to combine Marmor with Hallmark because both inventions are directed towards querying database(s).

Marmor's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hallmark's invention because both inventions use databases on computers. Hallmark discloses a method and apparatus for implementing parallel operations in a database management system comprising processing on a distributed/parallel, partitioned database. However, Hallmark does not expressly disclose limiting I/O transfer elapsed time. Marmor discloses a peer-to-peer commerce system comprising a TTL query packet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Marmor and Hallmark before him/her to take the TTL from Marmor and install it into the invention of Hallmark, thereby offering the obvious advantage of not having immortal query packets thereby speeding up the system by limiting how long I/O is sent by the elimination of old query packets..

Claim 12 can be mapped to Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) as follows: "The computer system of claim 11, wherein the computer comprises a server computer, wherein the computer system further comprises a client computer associated with the server computer over a computer network, and wherein the client computer executes the query engine" [Hallmark, Figs. 1A-1D with Hallmark, col. 7, lines 19-23 with Hallmark, col. 7, lines 41-44 with Hallmark, col. 5, lines 23-44].

Claim 13 can be mapped to Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) as follows: "The computer system of claim 11, wherein the database comprises a distributed database so that the **first** memory space comprises a plurality of different locations linked by a computer network" [Hallmark, Figs. 1A-1D with Hallmark, col. 7, lines 19-23 with Hallmark, col. 7, lines 41-44].

Claim 14 can be mapped to Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) as follows: "The computer system of claim 11, wherein the query engine subsequently exports the desired range of data values to a fourth memory space" [Hallmark, col. 5, lines 20-33 with Hallmark, col. 6, lines 20-33].

Claim 15 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 4, in addition to a computer system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claim 4. Therefore, Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 4.

19. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,180 (Hallmark et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application

Art Unit: 2161

Publication No. 2002/0062310 (Marmor et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,758 (Dockes et al.).

Claims 16 and 17's limitation(s) have already been met by Claims 6 and 7's limitation(s), respectfully. Therefore, Claims 16 and 17 are rejected for the same reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claims 6 and 7, respectfully.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Dockes with Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) because both inventions are directed towards using databases in a client/server fashion.

Dockes's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hallmark (as modified by Marmor)'s invention because both inventions use databases. Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) discloses a method and apparatus for implementing parallel operations in a database management system comprising query processing on a distributed/parallel, partitioned database, however Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) does not expressly disclose the specific use of the database for manufacturing data or that the manufacturing data relates to data storage devices. Dockes discloses a system and method for production of compact discs on demand comprising writing CD's using a database of orders.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the specific use (manufacturing CD's/storage devices) and the manufacturing data from Dockes and install it into the invention of Hallmark (as modified by Marmor), thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to use Hallmark (as

Art Unit: 2161

modified by Marmor)'s invention for a data processing system that writes CD's for requesting users so they may obtain the CD requested in Docks.

20. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,180 (Hallmark et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062310 (Marmor et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,345 (Carley et al.).

For **Claim 18**, Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) teaches: "The computer system of claim 11, wherein the simultaneously executing step comprises."

Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "logging into a computer network associated with the database under a different login account for each query statement so that each query statement is simultaneously executed using the associated login account."

With respect to Claim 18, an analogous art, Carley, teaches: "...logging into a computer network associated with the database under a different login account for each query statement so that each query statement is simultaneously executed using the associated login account" [Carley, col. 130, lines 42-47 with Hallmark, col. 8, lines 12-16].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Carley with Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) because both inventions are directed towards using data in databases.

Art Unit: 2161

Carley's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hallmark (as modified by Marmor)'s invention because both inventions use databases on computers. Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) discloses a method and apparatus for implementing parallel operations in a database management system comprising query processing on a distributed/parallel, partitioned database, however Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) does not expressly disclose database security features. Carley discloses providing a notification when a plurality of users are altering similar data in a health care solution environment comprising the capability of implementing single logon.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the single logon with multiple account underpinning management from Carley and install it into the invention of Hallmark (as modified by Marmor), thereby offering the obvious advantage of using a simple method of allowing access to a subset of resources and establishing roles/permissions easily for the authority required. Including security features in Hallmark would also make the database more resistant to outside tampering (accidental or not).

21. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,180 (Hallmark et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062310 (Marmor et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,758 (Dockes et al.), further in view of "Man: Crontab(5)" (Crontab).

Claim 20's limitation(s) have already been met by Claim 10's limitation(s).

Therefore, Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claim 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Dockes and Crontab with Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) because the inventions are directed towards using computers.

Dockes's and Crontab invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hallmark (as modified by Marmor)'s invention because the inventions use computers. Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) discloses a method and apparatus for implementing parallel operations in a database management system comprising query processing on a distributed/parallel, partitioned database, however Hallmark (as modified by Marmor) does not expressly disclose the specific use of the database for a manufacturing process. Dockes discloses a system and method for production of compact discs on demand comprising writing CD's using a database of orders. Crontab discloses a computer command for daily repetitive execution of a command comprising the ability to execute a command on a daily basis.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the specific use (manufacturing CD's/storage devices) from Dockes and the crontab command from Crontab and install them into the invention of Hallmark (as modified by Marmor), thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to use Hallmark (as modified by Marmor)'s invention for a data processing system that writes CD's for requesting users so they may obtain the CD requested in Dockes. The

Art Unit: 2161

execution of getting an order from the database and making a job file from it would then be done on at least a daily basis to keep the job spooling directory relatively full at all times so that there is always at least one job ready for dispatch. This makes the autonomous system of Dockes more efficient.

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2161

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu M. Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brent Stace *B.S.*

Apu Mofiz
Apu Mofiz
SPE, TC 2100

cm